THE IDENTITY OF CAREX GYNANDRA SCHWEIN.—What must be regarded as the type material of C. gynandra is preserved on a sheet from Schweinitz's own herbarium, now at the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences, labelled in Schweinitz's hand "Carex gynandra Nobis Salem, N. C." This sheet contains the tops of five culms, all without bases, and evidently from three different plants. Culm 1 bears four very short pistillate spikes, 1.75-2.5 cm. long and about 5 mm. thick. The scales are nearly or quite awnless and gradually narrowed at the tip, and scarcely, if at all, exceed the perigynia. The latter are in excellent mature condition and perfectly representative of the form generally passing under the name gynandra. Culms 2 and 3 are alike. Their pistillate spikes are proportionally more slender than those of no. 1, 4 mm. thick, exclusive of awns, and 2.3-4 cm. long. The scales are abruptly contracted into short awns. The young perigynia are smooth, relatively broad, and rounded at the apex. These specimens appear to me to be at least as well referable to typical C. crinita as to var. gynandra. Culms 4 and 5 are again alike. The spikes are longer, 3.5-5 cm. long, the scales short-awned, and the young perigynia distinctly granular-roughened (though not nerved), suggesting at least an approach to C. Mitchelliana M. A. Curtis (cf. Rhodora xxv. 17 (1923).)

It is evident, then, that either Schweinitz or someone who arranged his herbarium after his death included in C. gynandra three more or less different elements. This is made still plainer by another speciman at the Philadelphia Academy labelled, in a hand which neither Mr. Bayard Long nor I recognized, as coming from "herb. Schw[einitz] sub nom[ine] gynandra—4th series." This specimen is, except for its short scales, very good C. crinita. Such confusion is readily explicable when it is recalled that Schweinitz in his original diagnosis distinguished C. gynandra solely by its short scales and was followed by Torrey in his earlier work.

Which of the three elements represented on the type sheet of C. gynandra should bear that name, in the present-day understanding of the group? Culms 2 and 3, if properly referred to typical C. crinita, are accounted for there. Culms 4 and 5 are referable, with slight doubt, to C. Mitchelliana and are similarly disposed of there. All are so immature as to make their determination somewhat uncertain. About culm 1, however, there is no possible doubt; it is in excellent condition and, though stunted, otherwise represents perfectly

the common plant to which the name gynandra is, and long has been generally applied. The reasonable course is to retain Schweinitz's name for that plant. That this is the proper procedure is further indicated by the fact that the specimen of C. gynandra sent by Schweinitz to Torrey and now at the New York Botanical Garden, which Mr. K. K. Mackenzie has kindly examined for me, proves also to be C. gynandra in the accepted sense.—C. A. Weatherby, Gray Herbarium.

Notes on two Ericaceae of the Boston District Flora.—Rhododendron nudiflorum (L.) Torr.—Only a single locality (Purgatory Swamp) for this pink azalea is given in the Flora of the Boston District. I have collected flowering specimens in rather moist woods at Stoughton Junction, 29 May 1909, and in dry woods at Westwood or vicinity, 27 May 1911. A portion of the first collection has been deposited in the herbarium of the New England Botanical Club.

Vaccinium vacillans Kalm² var. Crinitum Fernald.—This variety, distinguished by the pubescent twigs and under leaf surface, is not listed in the Flora. Specimens in young fruit were collected in gravelly soil in Stoughton on 15 June 1912 (Blake 3672) and on a gravelly bank in Stoughton on 16 June 1912 (3691). A specimen of the first collection has been placed in the New England Botanical Club herbarium.—S. F. Blake, Bureau of Plant Industry, Washington, D. C.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Rhodora 24: 155. 1922.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In Rhodora 16: 117, footnote 4 (1914), I stated that this specific name should be accredited to Torrey, not to Kalm. Although, as has been shown by Britten (Journ. Bot. 42: 55. 1904), Solander and not Kalm was the real namer of the plant, the fact that Torrey (Fl. N. Y. 1: 444. 1843) published the description of the new species under the heading "Vaccinium vaccillans, Kalm" makes it necessary to cite the name as V. vacillans Kalm ex Torr.

The date of the June issue, unpublished as this goes to press, will be announced later.